

Remarks

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed March 25, 2010.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

In the Office Action dated March 25, 2010, Claims 1, 5, 7, 14, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Foote et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,015,954, hereafter Foote). Claims 6, 17, 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote, as applied to claim 1 above, in view of official notice. Claims 8 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote, as applied to claim 5 above, in view of official notice. Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote in view of Rui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,349,005 B2, hereafter Rui).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendments

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 14 and 23, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1, 5-9, 14 and 17-24. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action dated March 25, 2010, Claims 1, 5, 7, 14, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Foote (U.S. Patent No. 7,015,954).

Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. *(Currently Amended) A method for managing audio devices located at a live event during the live event, comprising:*

capturing video content of the live event at a first location, wherein different areas of the live event are associated with a plurality of audio devices located at the first location, the plurality of audio devices capturing audio originating from the different areas in the live event;

providing the video content of the live event captured at the first location to a user at a second location during the live event, wherein the video content is displayed to the user in a graphical user interface (GUI) that enables the user to select regions of the displayed video content, and wherein each region of the displayed video content shows one of the different areas of the live event;

receiving through the GUI a selection of a first region of the video content, the

selection made

*by the user during the live event, and
within the video content shown in the GUI;*

determining a first area of the live event associated with the first region;

*determining which audio devices at the first location are associated with the first area
of the live event;*

*selecting a first audio device at the first location associated with the first area of the
live event; and*

*providing live audio from the selected first audio device at the first location to the
user at the second location.*

Foote discloses a camera array [that] captures plural component images which are combined into a single scene from which “panning” and “zooming” within the scene are performed. (Abstract). Remote and locally located cameras typically include devices for camera control. Devices include stepping motors or other mechanisms configured to point the camera or an image capturing device toward a scene or point of interest. (Column 1, lines 33-36). Once the scene is combined into a single image, portions of the single image are selected for panning or zooming. An output or display is then provides the image to a user or to another device (for transmission to a remote location, for example). The [inventors in Foote] have also enhanced the invention [in Foote] by utilizing an automatic selection of images to be displayed via panning, zooming, or other imaging technique. For example, in one embodiment, directional microphones may be utilized to determine a direction in which activity is taking place in the scene, and the camera array is automatically panned to that portion of the scene. In another embodiment, motion detectors are utilized to determine motion and direct a panning operation of the camera array. (Column 3, lines 11-24).

Although Foote appears to disclose that portions of a single image can be selected for panning or zooming, in Foote when portions are selected, the camera appears to pan and zoom to that portion. Thus, the selection of a portion of the image changes the orientation of the camera by panning and zooming. However, Claim 1, as amended, recites determining a first area of the live event associated with the first region; determining which audio devices at the first location are associated with the first area of the live event; selecting a first audio device at the first location associated with the first area of the live event; and providing live audio from the selected first audio device at the first location to the user at the second location. Thus, in the embodiment of Claim 1 as amended, in response to a selection of a first region of the video content, audio is provided from audio devices associated with the first region. Applicant respectfully submits that Foote does not appear to disclose or render obvious these features.

Claim 1, as amended, further recites that different areas of the live event are associated with a plurality of audio devices located at the first location, the plurality of audio devices capturing audio originating from the different areas in the live event.

In Foote audio appear to be used to automatically select regions of the image, such as by determining a direction of an audio source location. However, Foote does not appear to disclose that different areas of the live event are associated with a plurality of audio devices. Instead, in Foote, audio devices merely appear to be present at the scene. Applicant respectfully submits that Foote does not appear to disclose or render obvious that different areas of the live event are associated with a plurality of audio devices, as recited by Claim 1 as amended.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 14

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claim 14 has been similarly amended to more clearly recite the embodiment therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 14 is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 7, 18 and 20

Claims 5, 7, 18 and 20 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1 or 14. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 5, 7, 18 and 20 are allowable as depending upon an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. However, to assist the Examiner in examining these claims, Applicant has provided comments below on several of these claims.

Claims 7 and 18 recite determining that no audio device is associated with the first region; and determining an alternative audio device to operate as the audio device associated with the first region, the alternative audio device configured to capture audio associated with the first region. Applicant respectfully submits that Foote does not appear to disclose an alternative audio device, as recited by Claims 7 and 18.

Claims 5 and 20 have not been addressed separately herein; however, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments

provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action dated March 25, 2010, Claims 6, 17, 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote, as applied to Claim 1 above, in view of official notice. Claims 8 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote, as applied to Claim 5 above, in view of official notice. Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote in view of Rui (U.S. Patent No. 7,349,005 B2).

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claim 23 has been similarly amended to more clearly recite the embodiment therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 23 is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 8-9, 17, 19, 21-22 and 24 are not addressed separately herein; however Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 25, 2010

By: /Nathan L. Feld/
Nathan L. Feld
Reg. No. 59,725

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800